Remarks/Arguments:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-9 remain in the application. Claims 1 and 7 have been amended.

In item 4 on page 3 of the above-identified Office action, claims 1 and 6-9 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by Notredame (U.S. Patent No. 6,049,390) under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

The rejection has been noted and the claims have been amended in an effort to even more clearly define the invention of the instant application. The claims are patentable for the reasons set forth below. Support for the changes is found on page 12, lines 5-10 of the specification.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claims 1 and 7 call for, *inter alia*:

storing the raster data column by column in a raster memory with random access while being generated by the raster processor.

Amended claims 1 and 7 are clearly directed to the actual raster image data generation process. The claims recite that while the raster data are being generated in the raster processor they are stored column by column in the memory.

The amended claims are in contrast the disclosure of Notredame on column 35, lines 48-67, to which the Examiner refers. This is because the Notredame does not disclose a raster generating process, because lines 44-48 disclose that the page elements are already post tipping and are therefore already ripped images made of pixels. Of course the ripped images in raster form are always arranged row by row and column by column, which is the typical characterizing feature of raster data. But according to the cited paragraph, the data are already **in the post ripped** state and the cited paragraph does not disclose how the page elements have to be rastered and ripped or how the data are stored when the raster data are generated.

According to amended claims 1 and 7, the new feature of storing raster data column by column while being generated is

clearly part of the raster data generating process and **not of** any post ripping process.

Furthermore, Fig. 10 of Notredame discloses a printing device (1019), but it is silent about reading out raster data column by column into an image setting unit. Notredame discloses on two RIP systems (1009) and states that more or fewer RIP systems can be used (column 10, lines 16-33). Notredame discloses that the RIP system may be part of work station (1005) or part of a computer system used to embody the rapid merge system (1003). The paragraph does not disclose that the raster data being generated in the RIP systems (1009) are stored while being generated column by column. On line 67, of column 35, Notredame discloses that the page element cache (1011) is made for storing page elements and is part of the rapid merge system (1003). Notredame is silent on the raster data generating process.

As seen from the above-given remarks, the reference does not show storing the raster data column by column in a raster memory with random access while being generated by the raster processor, as recited in claims 1 and 7 of the instant application. The Notredame reference discloses a **post** RIP process. Notredame does not storing raster data column by column in a raster memory with random access while being

generated by a raster processor. This is contrary to the invention of the instant application as claimed, which recites storing the raster data column by column in a raster memory with random access while being generated by the raster processor.

In item 6 on page 5 of the above-identified Office action, claims 2-5 have been rejected as being obvious over Notredame (U.S. Patent No. 6,049,390) in view of Agarwal (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0022815 A1) under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Agarwal does not make up for the deficiencies of Notredame. Since claim 1 is believed to be allowable, dependent claims 2-5 are believed to be allowable as well.

Even though claims 2-5 are believed to be allowable, the following remarks pertain to Agarwal reference.

Agarwal is silent as to the raster data creation process and does not disclose storing raster data column by column in a raster data memory while the raster data are being generated.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claims 1 or 7. Claims 1 and 7 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and

since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claims 1 or 7, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-9 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Applic. No. 10/075,670
Amdt. dated June 23, 2006
Reply to Office action of March 23, 2006

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

Alfred K. Dassler
52,794

For Applicant(s)

AKD:cgm

June 23, 2006

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101